



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097098,366	06/17/98	HIGASHIYAMA N	13237-2150

LM02/0718
M TODD MITCHEM
JONES & ASKEW
191 PEACHTREE STREET SUITE 3700
ATLANTA GA 30303-1769

EXAMINER
BASHORE, W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2776	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/098,366

Applicant(s)

Hlgashiyama et al.

Examiner

William L. Bashore

Group Art Unit

2776

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 24, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2776

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 4/24/2000 to the original Application filed on 6/17/1998.
2. The rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter and Gipson has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
3. Claims 1, 3-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter and Gipson.
4. Claims 1, 3-20 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 10, 15 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 3-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter, U.S. Patent No. 5,857,212 issued January 1999, in view of Gipson, U.S. Patent No. 7,778,402 issued July 1998.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Van De Vanter teaches a method of text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor, along with white space (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim 1(a)).

Art Unit: 2776

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (see Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with claim 1(b)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor, along with white space (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of changing cursor presentation to indicate anticipated location an insertion point and formatting type in close proximity. However, Gipson teaches a method of an autocorrect feature which alters presented and inserted character strings (see Gipson column 20 lines 38-44; compare with claim 1(c)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches the use of cursor movement and placement management (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim 1(d)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby a cursor is positioned in a displayed program for editing purposes (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 58-63; compare with claim 1(e)).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby various types of mouse clicks can be used in the embodiment of the invention as disclosed by Van De Vanter (see Van De Vanter column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 4, with reference to the rejection of claim 1, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of repeating the steps of claim 1(a) - 1(e) upon no indication of cursor

Art Unit: 2776

placement. However, Gipson teaches a method of repeating an evaluation routine using a transition rule (see Gipson column 17 lines 28-31; compare with claim 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of repetition, providing increased completeness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Van De Vanter teaches a method of text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor, along with white space (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of formatting comprising the addition/deletion of document properties. However, Gipson teaches a method of an autocorrect feature which can add/delete inserted character strings (see Gipson column 20 lines 38-44; compare with claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 6, with reference to the rejection of claim 1, Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby localized lexical analysis is performed subsequent to an insertion point defining a position of user editing (see Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-33; compare with claim 6).

In regard to dependent claim 7, with reference to the rejection of claim 1, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of associating a rule with formatting steps, as well as a method for matching context information with a trigger and selecting a corresponding rule. However, Gipson teaches a

Art Unit: 2776

method whereby rules are associated with, and used to trigger evaluation routines for the ultimate purpose of autocorrecting input (see Gipson column 10 lines 9-13, 15-18, 25-30; compare with claim 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of rules based autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness and accuracy to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 8, with reference to the rejection of claim 1, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of associating a rule with formatting steps, said formatting steps performed with a coinciding rule. However, Gipson teaches a method whereby rules are associated and used to trigger evaluation routines for the ultimate purpose of autocorrecting input, the autocorrecting performing a sequence of steps resulting in replacement of text (see Gipson column 10 lines 9-13, 15-18, 25-30, column 22 lines 4-17; compare with claim 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of rules based autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness and accuracy to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 9, claim 9 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 8, and is rejected as such.

Art Unit: 2776

In regard to independent claim 10, claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected as such.

(see claim 1(a); compare with claim 10(a)).

(see claim 1(b); compare with claim 10(b)). In addition, Van De Vanter teaches the use of a database for storing lexical rules (see Van De Vanter column 11 lines 54-57; compare with claim 10(b)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of cursor selection and display based upon insertion point position resulting in different editing behaviors (see Van De Vanter column 37 lines 59-67, column 37 lines 1-2; compare with claim 10(c) and 10(d)).

In regard to dependent claim 11, Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby an I-beam cursor is presented based upon the position of an insertion point in the document (see Van De Vanter column 37 lines 19-24; compare with claim 11).

In regard to dependent claim 12, Van De Vanter teaches a method of alignment markers placed around tokens for centering lines, and automatic aligning between lines (see Van De Vanter column 39 lines 9-23; compare with claim 12).

In regard to dependent claim 13, claim 13 is rejected using the Examiner's argument and rationale as set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

Art Unit: 2776

In regard to dependent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 13, and is rejected as such.

In regard to independent claim 15, claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 4, 8, and 10, and in further view of the following, is rejected as such.

(see claim 10(a); compare with claim 15(a)).

(see claim 10(b); compare with claim 15(b)).

(see claim 8; compare with claim 15(c)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of matching an I-beam cursor relevant to various insertion point positions (see Van De Vanter column 36 lines 64-67, column 37 lines 1-3; compare with claim 15(d)).

(see claim 4; compare with claim 15(e)).

In regard to dependent claim 16, claim 16 is rejected using the Examiner's argument and rationale as set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

In regard to dependent claim 17, Van De Vanter teaches a method of text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor, along with white space (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method whereby formatting properties are stored in association with a coinciding rule. However, Gipson teaches a method of an autocorrect feature which alters presented and inserted character strings by way of a composite rule creating a delayed edit action

Art Unit: 2776

(see Gipson column 20 lines 38-44, column 19 lines 65-67, column 20 lines 1-6; compare with claim 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 18, claim 18 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 17, and is rejected as such.

In regard to dependent claim 19, Van De Vanter teaches a method of a token stream, whereby dynamic user input results in updating insertion points and cursor positions of each dynamic editing action which can be used with a mouse (see Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35, column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 19).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Van De Vanter teaches a method of an insertion point defining an actual editing location, said cursor location and analysis is updated subsequent to a user edit (see Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35; compare with claim 20).

7. **Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.**

Bluethman et al.	U.S. Patent No. 3,654,611	issued	April	1972
Gipson	U.S. Patent No. 5,754,737	issued	May	1998
Van De Vanter	U.S. Patent No. 5,813,019	issued	September	1998
Newsted et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,016,467	issued	January	2000

Art Unit: 2776

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 4/24/2000 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on p.2 of the Amendment that *Van de Vanter* is directed towards a computer program editor, in contrast to Applicant's invention which deals with editing electronic documents. This argument is essentially repeated on pp.3-4 of the Amendment with respect to Examiner's motivation for combining *Van de Vanter* with *Gipson*. The Examiner respectfully notes that *Van de Vanter* is a text editor which ultimately displays user text input into a pretty printed form on a screen. While *Van de Vanter* is directed towards computer language editing (ie. C++ editor/compiler, see also *Van de Vanter* Figures 7A-7B), nevertheless, this is a form of document editing, and is considered analogous art. In addition, *Gipson* teaches editing word processing documents. Both *Van de Vanter* and *Gipson* are from the same field of endeavor (document processing/editing, both are classified as 707/500+), therefore the motivation to combine would not be counterintuitive, as asserted by Applicant.

Applicant further asserts on p.2 of the Amendment that *Van de Vanter* does not teach the collection of context information regarding a location of a cursor in a document. In addition to the Examiner's citing of *Van de Vanter* to teach the movement and placement of a cursor, *Van de Vanter* also teaches a cursor I-beam, whereby the physical contextual display of said cursor is dependant upon the position of said cursor relevant to the position of editable character elements (its context) (please see *Van de Vanter* column 36 lines 59-67, column 37 lines 1-5).

Applicant further argues on pp.2-3 of the Amendment that *Gipson* does not describe the step of "changing a presentation of the cursor to indicate an anticipated location of the insertion point....close

Art Unit: 2776

proximity to the cursor location". The Examiner notes that, in addition to *Gipson's* teaching, the primary reference (*Van de Vanter*) does teach the changing of cursor presentation via a changing of cursor I-beam shape to differentiate between various insertion points (please see *Van de Vanter* column 36 lines 59-67). The I-beam cursor shape can be indicative of the amount of formatted white space to be applied (please see *Van de Vanter* column 37 lines 9-15).

Applicant argues on p.3 of the Amendment that *Van de Vanter* does not teach an "*indication to place an insertion point*". The Examiner respectfully notes that the cited text also teaches, in addition to the movement and display of a cursor, the management of white space, or gaps, between adjacent tokens. Since *Van de Vanter* teaches white space management via a cursor I-beam (which is an insertion point), the cursor taught in the cited reference pertains to said cursor I-beam.

Applicant further argues on p. 4 of the Amendment that *Van de Vanter* does not teach mouse clicks to indicate insertion points in a document. The Examiner notes that *Van de Vanter* teaches the movement of a cursor for editing purposes via keyboard inputs. When the input device includes a mouse, these interactions could also include various types of mouse clicks (please see *Van de Vanter* column 9 lines 34-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art to use mouse clicks for this purpose, because of the cited teaching in combination with the fact that utilizing mouse clicks for said purposes is well known in the computer software art.

Applicant further asserts on pp.4-5 of the Amendment that *Gipson* does not teach limitation of adding and deleting properties to place the insertion point in a document. The Examiner respectfully notes that the *Gipson* citing was chosen for this rejection because of the autocorrect feature which detects a character string and replaces it with another string (adding/deleting properties). There is nothing in claim 5 which precludes an autocorrecting embodiment to teach said properties. In addition, said adding and

Art Unit: 2776

deleting properties are taught by *Van de Vanter* via a “delete next character” command when a cursor is positioned in a flow corresponding to the various insertion positions, said properties are defined in Table 6 (please see *Van de Vanter* column 25 lines 44-50, also Table 6).

Applicant argues on p.5 of the Amendment that *Van de Vanter* does not teach the claim 6 limitation of collecting context information in response to a cursor location change. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The main embodiment of *Van de Vanter* is an editor which, along with a cursor I-beam input method, performs various editing and formatting functions. The cursor position is dynamic in the sense that various positions are selected by the user with said cursor, as applied to the editor as taught by *Van de Vanter*.

Applicant further asserts on p.5 of the Amendment (also repeated on p.6) that *Gipson* teaches autoformatting, therefore the rule selection of *Gipson* is irrelevant to the rules selection of the present invention. The Examiner notes that there is nothing in claim 7 which precludes the use of autoformatting. The limitation of placing an insertion point in a document is taught by *Van de Vanter*, as previously discussed. *Gipson* teaches the limitation of sets of rules used for triggering evaluation routines.

Applicant also argues on p.10 of the Amendment that claim 10 is directed towards displaying a cursor rather than a method for placing an insertion point. The Examiner respectfully notes that the primary reference (*Van de Vanter*) teaches both cursor display and a method for placing an insertion point via a cursor I-beam. The cursor I-beam is a visual “I” displayed on a screen, the position of which is dictated by a user. In addition, the displayed “I” changes shape relative to white space length, hence a change in visible cursor shape (a plurality of cursors) (please see *Van de Vanter* column 36 lines 59-67). This cursor also doubles as an insertion point as previously discussed.

Art Unit: 2776

Applicant further argues on p.7 of the Amendment that the I-beam cursor described in *Van de Vanter* is not associated with a coinciding rule and chosen from a plurality of cursors. The Examiner notes that *Van de Vanter* does teach I-beam position associated with various rules (please see *Van de Vanter* column 25 lines 44-50, also Table 6).

Applicant also argues on p.7 of the Amendment that *Van de Vanter* does not teach different cursors (left/right alignment icons, etc.) As claimed in claim 12. The Examiner notes that in addition to a movable I-beam cursor, alignment markers can be used. The markers are inserted by a user within the editing field (please see *Van de Vanter* column 37 lines 50-55). In addition, these alignment marker symbols can be “grabbed” by a mouse and placed accordingly (please see *Van de Vanter* column 38 lines 66-67 column 39 lines 1). The teaching of alignment markers, along with I-beam cursor changes, render claim 12 obvious, because of *Van de Vanter*’s teaching of various display representations indicative of different editing operations.

Applicant argues on p.8 that claim 13, 14 are different from claim 4 because they relate to a method for displaying a cursor. The Examiner respectfully notes that in addition to the teachings associated with the rejection of claim 4, *Van de Vanter* does teach the displaying of a cursor via cursor I-beam, said cursor changing in shape according to amount of white space involved.

Applicant argues on p.8 of the Amendment that *Van de Vanter* does not teach the limitation of determining whether the location of the insertion point matches the location of the cursor. The Examiner notes that the I-beam cursor taught by *Van de Vanter* teaches this limitation. As a user selects an insertion point, the insertion point is placed where the user selects on the screen. The actual cursor is visible, so the insertion point matches the location of the cursor because the I-beam cursor is obviously placed where a user wants an insertion point.

Art Unit: 2776

Applicant further argues that claim 19 and 20 are different from claim 1 because they comprise additional steps not disclosed by the prior art. The Examiner notes that *Van de Vanter* teaches mouse input clicks as previously discussed. Merely selecting insertion points via mouse clicks as disclosed in claim 19 is well known in the computer software art. In addition, in regard to claim 20, *Van de Vanter* teaches a method of an insertion point defining an actual editing location, said cursor location and analysis is updated subsequent to a user edit (see Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is (703) 308-5807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached on (703) 305-4713. The fax number to this art unit is (703) 308-6606.

Art Unit: 2776

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

10. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 305-9724 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

William L. Bashore
7/13/2000


**STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**